UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/588,727	08/08/2006	Takuo Suzuki	129039	2417
25944 OLIFF & BERI	7590 04/21/201 RIDGE, PLC	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3208	350	SASTRI, SATYA B		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1796	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/21/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

OfficeAction25944@oliff.com jarmstrong@oliff.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/588,727	SUZUKI ET AL.
Examiner initiated interview daminary	Examiner	Art Unit
	SATYA B. SASTRI	1796
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>71</u>	
(1) <u>SATYA B. SASTRI</u> .	(3)	
(2) Mr. Richard Castellano.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 19 April 2010	Time: <u>11.30am</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed:		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	e examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
/Satya B Sastri/ Examiner, Art Unit 1796 (A	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Application No. 10/588,727

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's attorney was contacted to discuss possible claim amendment. It was noted that (1) claim 1 as amended lacks clarity because the claim language recites the matrix as comprising an acrylic copolymer (A) (i.e. in singular form) while the newly added limitation drawn to "the major constitutional polymer of the acrylic copolymer" suggests a copolymer blend. It was noted that even though the specification defines the acrylic copolymer (A) as including a copolymer derived from two or more monomers or a blend of two of more acrylic homopolymers or a blend of two or more acrylic copolymers, the newly added limitation is restrictive to the scenario where blends are involved but is not meaningful when an acrylic copolymer is derived from two or more monomers. As such, the specification does not recite that the copolymer may be block copolymer and therefore, the limitation "major constitutional polymer of the acrylic copolymer" raises potential 112 indefiniteness issues. Possible amendment was suggested to define the acrylic copolymer as defined in the specification and further amending the claim language. Additionally, (2) it was noted in view of the newly found art to McGarry (US 4, 478,963), incorporating limitations from claim 5 into claim 1 would potentially place the application in condition for allowance. Applicant's attorney indicated that the proposed amendment would be considered upon consultation with the client and that the examiner would be notified by 4/22/10.